

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AUCKLAND REGISTRY**

IN THE MATTER

of appeals under Clause 14(1) of the
First Schedule of the Resource
Management Act 1991 and pursuant
to Section 274 of the Act.

AND IN THE MATTER

of the Far North Proposed District Plan

BETWEEN

**Vision Kerikeri, Our Kerikeri
Community Trust, Kapiro
Conservation Trust and Carbon
Neutral NZ Trust**

Appellant

AND

Far North District Council

Respondent

**NOTICE OF THE WISH OF HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND
TO BE PARTY TO PROCEEDINGS**

1 September 2026

To: The Registrar of the Environment Court in Auckland

1. Horticulture New Zealand ("**HortNZ**") wishes to be a party pursuant to section 274 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**") to the following proceedings:
 - (a) Vision Kerikeri, Our Kerikeri Community Trust, Kapiro Conservation Trust and Carbon Neutral NZ Trust v Far North District Council.
2. HortNZ made submissions and further submissions on the Far North Proposed District Plan (submission number 159 and further submission number 354).
3. HortNZ also has an interest in these proceedings that is greater than the general public as it represents interest groups in the community that are likely to be affected by the proposed relief sought by the Appellant.
4. HortNZ is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the RMA.
5. HortNZ is interested in part of the proceedings.
6. The parts of the proceedings HortNZ is interested in are set out in the appellants appeal Annex 1 as follows:

	<i>Parts of the decision appealed</i>	<i>Reasons for appeal</i>	<i>Relief sought</i>
(a)	<i>Crop protection structures</i>	<i>Major adverse effects on visual amenity in rural and suburban areas. Amendments on crop protection structures as stated in our submissions.</i>	<i>Standard to reduce visual dominance: 3m setback from boundaries (as in ODP); landscaping on boundaries adjacent to public roads and residential properties; specified colours.</i>
(b)	<i>Rezoning proposed by Kiwi Fresh Orange (KFO)</i>	<i>KFO site is important future growth area. It is the only development location that offers essential new connectivity, bridges, road links and cycleways between SH10, Waipapa Road, Kerikeri (essential for reducing Kerikeri's ever-increasing traffic issues); more compact urban footprint for Kerikeri Waipapa area overall7; large-scale integrated development plan; large public reserves protecting river margins, wetland; cycling/walking networks; wastewater treatment system, bridges and other infrastructure paid by developer. Significantly, KFO site offers affordable housing of the type demanded by the market and community (due to lower land price and efficiency of scale). PDP-R is</i>	<i>Rezone KFO site for development, and amend PDP-R provisions as indicated in this table</i>

		<i>unable to achieve this. KFO has suitable site for large hotel (needed in this area), and offers considerable employment boost for local economy. Spatial Plan8 planners did not provide fair, balanced information about pros and cons of KFO site and development options in public consultation documents.</i>	
(c)	<i>Omissions, insufficient alignment with key policies, and clarifications: Further points inserted in zone chapters and other relevant chapters</i>	<i>A number of PDP provisions/rules do not adequately implement parts of RMA s2 and matters raised in our submissions and statements, including provisions to support well-functioning environments, amenity (including visual amenity), community values, ecological values or significance criteria. For example, provisions should support visual amenity and landscaping, and also avoid or minimise adverse effects of visually dominant infrastructure structures (e.g. mobile phone towers, substations, bus shelters, etc) by requiring setbacks, good quality landscaping and other means. A number of matters of discretion fail to include key points that are stated in Policies. Also need to address cumulative and long-term effects and introduce further points in provisions to improve alignment with related Policies.</i>	<i>Further provisions needed, particularly standards, to support community wellbeing, community values, especially amenity, ecological values, and to implement similar points stated in RMA, national direction, and Policies of PDP.</i>

7. Reasons for interest:

- i. Relief sought (a) is opposed for the reasons described in the Hearings Panel recommendations and adopted by the Far North District Council.
- ii. Relief sought (b) is opposed for the reasons described in the Hearings Panel recommendations adopted by the Far North District Council and HortNZ have particular concerns with reverse sensitivity effects at the rural production zone interface.
- iii. Relief sought (c) is opposed as the relief sought is unclear.

8. NZ agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Sarah Cameron

Senior Policy Advisor
Horticulture New Zealand

1 September

Address for service of the Appellant:

Horticulture New Zealand
PO Box 10232, Wellington 6143
Phone: 04 470 5669 M: 021 446 281
Email: Sarah.Cameron@hortnz.co.nz
Contact person: Sarah Cameron